



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/549,236	04/13/2000	KEVIN W. CARLEY	AND1P405	7816

29838 7590 04/07/2005

OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY, LLP (ACCENTURE)  
PLAZA VII, SUITE 3300  
45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-1609

EXAMINER
----------

MORGAN, ROBERT W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/549,236

Applicant(s)

CARLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Robert W. Morgan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/13/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/17/04 has been entered.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure filed 12/13/04 has been acknowledge and entered in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 19, 21, 24, 26, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to Edwards et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,883 to Lee et al.

As per claim 19, Buchanan et al. teach a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) used to manage document templates as well as storing, retrieving and manipulating data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et

Art Unit: 3626

al. further teaches that the templates are created and selected by the user (reads on “selecting a data management template”) according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). In addition, Buchanan teaches a document generation system using relational databases that are implemented using a B-tree model and the database manipulation is preformed through program calls to executable functions provided to a program (column 5, lines 52-57). Additionally, Buchanan et al. teaches that once a user has defined (48, Fig. 2B) and selected a desired document template (22, Fig. 2A), in particular order, the template is stored on the electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) (reads on “selecting a data management template, wherein the data management template organizes into a tier structure, wherein a first tier must be loaded before a second tier are loaded”) (see: column 14, lines 5-15). This suggests that the user already establishes the order of the template and after completion of the document the load is sorted before it is loaded into the database.

Buchanan et al. fail to teach multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

- (a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;
- (b) receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files;
- (c) receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords;
- (e) validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met;

Art Unit: 3626

- (f) loading the validated data into the database; and,
- (g) compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template.

Edwards et al. teaches a network verification system including a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not having matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1) or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56) (reads on “validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template; loading the validated data into the database; and, compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template”). The Examiner considers the step of comparing data to included verifying the matched and unmatched data before it is compiled to generated an error report (reads on “generating error and summary reports for a data load”).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the validation of the loaded data as well as the compiling and generating of an error report as taught by Edwards within the computer-assisted document template system with a relational database as taught by Buchanan et al. with the motivation of detecting and preparing a summary report of matched and unmatched data in a database which better informs the user of any discrepancy involved with data being stored in the database.

Buchanan et al. and Edwards fail to teach multi-tier client/server architecture, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 3626

- (a) maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database;
- (b) receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files; and
- (c) receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords; and
- (e) validating data by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met.

Hobbs teaches a multi-tier client/server model (reads on “a multi-tier client/server architecture”) for record retrieval from a database based on embedded expert judgments linked to words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text entered by the user (reads on “receiving a plurality of user-selected keywords, wherein data contained within said user input data files is organized around the keywords”) (see: column 1, lines 20-42). Hobbs further teaches a client/server system includes a user remoter PC client (200, Fig. 3) connected to front-end communication servers (210, Fig. 3) that run and feed application queries through a database interface (200, Fig. 3) to the designated Data Warehouse (230, Fig. 3) (see: column 14, lines 42 to column 15, lines 27). Furthermore, Hobbs teaches that a client (203, Fig. 4), coupled to the Document Server (202, Fig. 4), including a browser that establishes a connection with the remoter servers (reads on “maintaining a connection between multiple user stations and a server having a database”) (see: column 15, lines 29-35). In addition, the client (203, Fig. 4) sends requests for information (client requests) to and receives information from the document server

Art Unit: 3626

(202, Fig. 4) (reads on “receiving from one of the user stations a plurality of user input data files”) (see: column 15, lines 29-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database using linked words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text as taught by Hobbs with system as taught by Buchanan et al. and Edwards with the motivation of connecting “linked terms” to database records or templates, thereby saving enormous labor and time cost involved in updating a database (see: Hobbs: column 6, lines 55-61).

Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs fail to explicitly teach (e) (e) validating data by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks are met.

Lee et al. teaches system and method for creating validation rules to confirm input data using validation rules program (15, Fig. 2) (see: column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 19). Lee et al. further teaches nine comparison templates (481-489, Fig. 11) used to validate, compare and test the contents information entered into a field against one or more predetermined literal values, numeric values, character and alphanumeric strings (see: column 10, lines 19 to column 12, lines 7). The Examiner considers the comparison templates as capable of enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks since the comparison templates test the contents of fields against preset criteria.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include validation rules and comparison templates as taught by Lee et al. with the

Art Unit: 3626

system of Buchanan et al., Edwards and Hobbs with the motivation of using validation rules to test the content of field entered by a user to ensure that field is filled out correctly thereby catching any errors before the user leaves the service site (see: Lee et al.: column 2, lines 32-38).

As per claim 21, Buchanan et al. teaches the claimed user input data files are medical files (see: column 7, lines 37-45 and Fig. 1).

Claim 24 differs from method claim 19 by reciting a “system for generating... “ in the preamble and recitation of logic in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a document generation system using a relational database that are implemented using B-tree model and the database manipulation is performed through program calls to executable functions provided by a program (see: column 5, lines 52-57). The remainder of claim 24 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

As per claims 26 and 31, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 21.

Claim 29 differs from method claim 19 by reciting, “a computer program embodied on the computer readable medium...” in the preamble and recitation of code segments in the body of the claim. As per this limitation, Buchanan et al. teaches a computer-assisted system that includes and electronic display (14, Fig. 1), data-processing device (16, Fig. 1) and electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) used for storing information within a relational database (2, Fig. 1) (see: column 4, lines 14-26). The remainder of claim 29 repeats the limitations of claim 19, and is therefore rejected for the same reasons given above for claim 19.

6. Claims 20, 22-23, 25, 27-28, 30 and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,267,155 to Buchanan et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,410,551 to



Art Unit: 3626

Edwards et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,523,022 to Hobbs as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,576 to Dauerer et al.

As per claim 20, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs teach a relational database comprising a series of data structure linked through common fields and the data structures are used to store user responses during document creation (see: column 5, lines 39-52).

Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs fails to teach the claimed no data are loaded into the database if any of the data does not match the data management template.

Dauerer et al. teaches a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: column 14, lines 20-26). Since Dauerer et al. teaches denying access to the system once the detection of invalid or duplicate authorization occurs (see: column 4, lines 47-59). The Examiner considers denying of access once invalid or duplicate authorization occurs to include record invalidation that basically interrupts any further transmission of the records associated with the invalid or mismatched information and prevents the storing of the record into database.

One ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to include transmitting of reports including mismatch data as taught Dauerer et al. with the system as taught by Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., and Hobbs with the motivation of

Art Unit: 3626.

providing the user with several error report to ensure that inaccurate information is not being loading into the database.

As per claim 22, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed steps of separating data that match the data management template from data that do not match the data management template, and sending the data that do not match the data management template to the user station. This limitation is met by the comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between all compared data as well as generating reports that include records of the matched and unmatched data (see: Edwards et al.: column 26, lines 38-56). In addition, Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Dauerer et al. a data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26).

As per claim 23, Dauerer et al. teaches the claimed step of sending a notification upon detecting a concurrently executing load process. This feature is met by the data processing system that sorts and detected any mismatch data in addition to transmitting a plurality of reports to a remote user and these reports are distinguishable according to the mismatch data processed (see: Dauerer et al.: column 14, lines 20-26). The Examiner considers the transmission of reports to a remote user as notification to the user of the data that is matched and mismatched as well as the data that is entered and not entered into database.

As per claims 25 and 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

As per claims 30 and 32-33, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 20 and 22-23, respectively.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/17/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the response filed 12/17/04.

(A) In the remarks, Applicants argue in substance that, (1) the four references do not teach or suggest at least four of the claim limitation, namely amended element (d) and elements (e), (f), and (g); (2) the motivation to combine the four references does not appear reasonable; and (3) the four references are not in the same field as the Applicants' invention.

(B) In response to the Applicant's arguments, (1) the four references do not teach or suggest at least four of the claim limitation, namely amended element (d) and elements (e), (f), and (g). The Examiner respectfully submits the reference of Buchanan et al. is relied on for teaching element (d) that includes a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) used to manage document templates as well as storing, retrieving and manipulating data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et al. further teaches that the templates are created and selected by the user (reads on "selecting a data management template") according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). In addition, Buchanan teaches a document generation system using relational databases that are implemented using a B-tree model and the database manipulation is preformed through program calls to executable functions provided to a program (column 5, lines 52-57). Additionally, Buchanan et al. teaches that once a user has defined (48, Fig. 2B) and

Art Unit: 3626

selected a desired document template (22, Fig. 2A), in particular order, the template is stored on the electronic storage device (20, Fig. 1) (reads on “selecting a data management template, wherein the data management template organizes into a tier structure, wherein a first tier must be loaded before a second tier are loaded”) (see: column 14, lines 5-15). This suggests that the user already establishes the order of the template and after completion of the document the load is sorted before it is loaded into the database.

With regards to elements (e), (f) and (g), the Examiner respectfully submits the reference of Edwards et al. was relied on for teaching part of element (e) regarding “validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template”, as well as fully addressing elements (f) and (g) that includes a network verification system using a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not having matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1) or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56) (reads on “validating that all data to be loaded into the database match the data management template; loading the validated data into the database; and, compiling a report identifying data that match the data management template and data that do not match the data management template”). The Examiner considers the step of comparing data to included verifying the matched and unmatched data before it is compiled to generated an error report (reads on “generating error and summary reports for a data load”).

The reference of Lee is relied of teaching the other part of element (e) regarding “validating data by enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field

Art Unit: 3626

checks are met” including a system and method for creating validation rules to confirm input data using validation rules program (15, Fig. 2) (see: column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 19). Lee et al. further teaches nine comparison templates (481-489, Fig. 11) used to validate, compare and test the contents information entered into a field against one or more predetermined literal values, numeric values, character and alphanumeric strings (see: column 10, lines 19 to column 12, lines 7). The Examiner considers the comparison templates as capable of enforcing business rules/requirements and ensuring that referential integrity, codependency, primary key, required field, default field, sequence number, and hard-coded field checks since the comparison templates test the contents of fields against preset criteria.

(C) In response to the Applicant's arguments, (2) the motivation to combine the four references does not appear reasonable. The Examiner respectfully submits that establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness is determined on the basis of the evidence as a whole and the relative persuasiveness of the arguments. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Hedges*, 783 F.2d 1038, 1039, 228 USPQ 685,686 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785,788 (Fed. Cir. 1984); and *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 1052, 189 USPQ 143,147 (CCPA 1976). Using this standard, the Examiner respectfully submits that he has at least satisfied the burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness, since he has presented evidence of corresponding claim elements in the prior art and has expressly articulated the combinations and the motivations for combinations that fairly suggest Applicant's claimed invention (see: section 4 above).

In addition, the Examiner recognizes obviousness is not determined by what the references expressly state but by what they would reasonably suggest to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 3626

the art, as supported by decisions in *In re DeLisle* 406 Fed 1326, 160 USPQ 806; *In re Kell, Terry and Davies* 208 USPQ 871; and *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ 2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (citing *In re Lulu*, 747 F.2d 703, 705, 223 USPQ 1257, 1258 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Further, it was determined in *In re Lamberti et al*, 192 USPQ 278 (CCPA) that:

- (i) obviousness does not require absolute predictability;
- (ii) non-preferred embodiments of prior art must also be considered; and
- (iii) the question is not express teaching of references, but what they would suggest.

Additionally, the Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily altered or modified and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed modifications. However, although the Examiner agrees that the motivation or suggestion to make modifications must be articulated, it is respectfully contended that there is no requirement that the motivation to make modifications must be expressly articulated within the references themselves. References are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosures, *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

Furthermore, the motivation to combine the teachings of Hobbs with the system of Buchanan and Edwards is given section 4 above, suggested in a passage from the Hobbs in column 6, lines 55-61, connecting "linked terms" to database records or templates, thereby saving enormous labor and time cost involved in updating a database (see: Hobbs: column 6, lines 55-61). In addition, the motivation to combine the teachings of Lee with the system of Buchanan, Edwards and Hobbs is given above, suggested in a passage from the Lee in column 2, lines 32-38, using validation rules to test the content of field entered by a user to ensure that field is filled out correctly thereby catching any errors before the user leaves the service site.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that an explanation based on logic and sound scientific reasoning of one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention that support a holding of obviousness has been adequately provided by the motivations and reasons indicated by the Examiner in the prior Office Action (paper number 5), *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 USPQ2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter., 4/22/93).

(D) In response to the Applicant's arguments, (3) the four references are not in the same field as the Applicants' invention. The Examiner respectfully submits that the prior art references are in the field of Applicant's endeavor. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Applicant's invention pertains to report creation and more particularly to compiling summary report during data load. The Examiner respectfully submits in this case that the primary reference, Buchanan et al. was relied upon for teachings loading data into a database utilizing a computer-assisted document generation system including a relational database (2, Fig. 1) used to manage document templates as well as storing, retrieving and manipulating data within the templates (see: column 5, lines 39-50). Buchanan et al. was further relied on for teaching selecting a data management template by making use of the templates created and selected by the user according to the type of report needed to accommodate a task (see: column 5, lines 5, 13-17). Edwards et al. was relied on for teaching the validating and loading all data loaded into the database and compiling reports identifying data that match the data management template and data that did not match the data management template using a network verification system including a comparing unit (180, Fig. 1) that detects mismatches between two lists of data items, first list (160, Fig. 1) and a second list (170, Fig. 1), also indicating any data item in the first list (160, Fig. 1) which do not having matching data item in the second list (170, Fig. 1)

Art Unit: 3626

or vice versa and then records them in an error report (190, Fig. 1) (see: column 26, lines 38-56). Hobbs was relied upon for teaching a multi-tier client/server model for record retrieval from a database using linked words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text (see: column 1, lines 20-42). Lee et al. was relied upon for teaching a system and method for creating validation rules to confirm input data using validation rules program (15, Fig. 2) (see: column 5, line 65 to column 6, line 19). Thus, it is the position of the Examiner that Buchanan et al., Edwards et al., Hobbs and Lee et al. are in the field of the Applicant's endeavor (i.e., managing document templates (Buchanan), validating data (Edwards), multi-tier client/server architecture (Hobbs), and validation rules (Lee)), and are therefore analogous art.

In light of above-mentioned examples, it is clear that each reference represents analogous art in reference to Applicant's invention through addressing all of limitations within independent claims 19, 24, and 29 and dependencies.

Moreover, it should be noted that the cited reference(s) was never applied as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102 against the pending claims. As such, the Examiner disputes that Applicant's remarks that the four references are not in the same field as the Applicants' invention.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that if Applicant's were correct in his assertion which Examiner does not admit, it has been held that prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention.

*W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).



Art Unit: 3626


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert W. Morgan whose telephone number is (703) 605-4441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rwm  
rwm

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600